

**WILLIAMSBURG  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES  
Tuesday, February 14, 2006**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE**

The regular semimonthly Architectural Review Board meeting was held on Tuesday, February 14, 2006, at 6:30 p.m. in the third Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Building.

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order. Present in addition to Mr. Williams were Board members Messrs. Edwards, Quarles, Hertzler, Lane and Klee. Absent was Board member Spence. Staff members present were Zoning Administrator Murphy and Secretary Scott.

**Consent Agenda**

Chairman Williams explained the consent agenda procedure to the audience stating that if an application is in full compliance with the ***Design Review Guidelines***, it is placed on the consent agenda. If no member of the Board has any question regarding the application and concurs that it is in full compliance with the *Guidelines*, the audience is asked if they are present to discuss any case on the Consent Agenda. If there is no one in the audience present to discuss any item on the Consent Agenda, those applications are approved as submitted and the applicants dismissed without further discussion.

Applications on the tonight's Consent Agenda:

\*ARB #06-016 Lavach/606 Indian Springs Court - Fence

\*ARB #06-017 Barlow/376-411 Merrimac Trail – Exterior Change (windows & doors)

\*ARB

SIGN #06-005 National Pancake & Waffle House/1605 Richmond Road – Monument & Building Mounted Signs

\*ARB

SIGN #06-006 Food for Thought/1647 Richmond Road – Monument & Building Mounted Signs

Mr. Williams moved to approve the consent agenda as submitted. Mr. Klee seconded the motion which carried by roll call vote of 6-0.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:	Edwards, Quarles, Hertzler, Williams, Lane, Klee
Nay:	None
Absent:	Spence

Chairman Williams announced that **ARB #06-008** and **ARB #06-009**, signage applications for **Red Hot & Blue Restaurant**, 1624 Richmond Road and **The Seafare Restaurant**, 1632 Richmond Road, have been deferred by the applicant until the next ARB meeting.

#### **ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT**

#### **ARB #06-014 Williams/516 Newport Avenue – Exterior Change (siding replacement) – Denied**

Billy and Sarah Williams, applicants/owners, stated that because the house was too small, they had an addition constructed. Their request tonight is to replace the aluminum siding, which covers wood siding on the original structure, with Hardiplank siding to match the addition.

Chairman Williams said he views the limited area as trim since the majority of the house is brick and the addition is already Hardiplank. Mr. Quarles stated it's a stretch to call this only "trim".

Mr. Klee noted the Board had approved removal of vinyl siding over wood siding rather than replacement with Hardiplank for a neighboring property and based on that experience, it's hard to then allow this applicant to do otherwise.

Chairman Williams stated the concern is replacement of the principle siding and this appears to be more like just an area of trim. He continued saying the **Design Review Guidelines** state that if synthetic trim is removed the applicant has a right to replace it with synthetic trim. The applicants stated they would like to avoid upkeep and will just leave the aluminum siding on.

Mr. Hertzler noted the **Design Review Guidelines** are currently under review, possibly having new districts and suggested the applicants check back with the Board once the revisions are approved since different opinions may be available. Mr. Hertzler asked if we are after preservation or aesthetics, and noted that once underlying material is gone, it is unlikely it will ever be replaced.

Mr. Hertzler moved that the Board deny the request to remove wood covered with aluminum siding for replacement with cementitious siding. Mr. Edwards seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 6-0.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:	Quarles, Williams, Lane, Hertzler, Klee, Edwards
Nay:	None
Absent:	Spence

**CORRIDOR PROTECTION DISTRICT**

**ARB #06-015 Milano's Restaurant/1635 Richmond Road – Exterior Change (reroof restaurant) – Approved with Conditions.**

Applicant/owner's son, Marino Kokolis, and Jeff Blankenship with Blankenship's Roofing Service, were present to respond to questions regarding the reroofing.

Chairman Williams noted the request is to change the roof material on the front and sides of the restaurant from shingles to a green standing seam metal roof with Zoning Administrator Murphy stating the ***Design Review Guidelines*** require the rear of the structure be dressed the same as the front and sides.

When asked if there is a reason for not changing all elevations of the roofing the applicant's representatives stated that there is a good cut off point on either side of the chimney and they would like to retain the look. Mr. Williams said the concern is the consistency of the building. He then moved that the request be approved with the condition that the roof replacement extends completely around the building. Mr. Lane seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 6-0.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:	Quarles, Williams, Lane, Hertzler, Klee, Edwards
Nay:	None
Absent:	Spence

Mr. Hertzler noted the applicant has the option to return to the Board with a better rendering if the representatives find the owner would still like the delineation to occur on the sides at the chimney.

**ARB #06-018 Carrabba's Italian Grill/2500 Richmond Road – New Restaurant – Approved with Conditions.**

Michael DeVere, AIA, with DP3 Architects was present representing the applicant.

Chairman Williams stated that staff has pointed out the alignment disparity of the pillars. The left column of the portico needs to line up with the two windows on the left as the right column does with the two windows on the right. Mr. DeVere said in real elevation this could never be seen and the layout is necessary due to the interior table placement.

Mr. Williams said there is a concern with the relative massing of the building and is there anything that can be done to mitigate the "step" appearance. Mr. DeVere said maybe a patio area could be included, but currently it's not in the plan.

Mr. Hertzler suggested landscaping between the Yankee Candle building and Carrabba's to help break up the massing. He asked if there is any way the building

could be shifted and Zoning Administrator Murphy responded there is not since all the parking and site improvements have already installed as well as curbing. Mr. Hertzler added that the addition of plants between the buildings would provide a break between Carrabba's and its behemoth neighbor, Yankee Candle.

Mr. Edwards said it is nice as a stand alone building, and asked if the applicant has given up on the idea of a gable roof. Mr. DeVere said due to the equipment which must be placed on the roof, they need a flat roof rather than the gable.

Mr. Williams moved that the plans for the new restaurant be approved with the condition that the applicant investigates, with City staff review, the practicality of installing foliage on the Yankee Candle building side to further break up the disparity of the height of the two buildings. Mr. Lane seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 6-0.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:	Quarles, Williams, Lane, Hertzler, Klee, Edwards
Nay:	None
Absent:	Spence

## **SIGNS**

### **ARB**

**Sign#06-007 Parkway Apartments/418 Merrimac Trail – Monument Sign – Approved.**

Representing the applicant was Forrest E. Bassett with Signs by Tomorrow. Mr. Bassett agreed to remove the web information on the base of the sign as suggested by staff to bring the sign into compliance with the size requirement of 24 square feet. He circulated a sample of the simulated brick proposed for the sign, noting the interior is made of a polystyrene material and the exterior is a very sturdy polymer. Mr. Bassett also presented photographs of the other signs using the synthetic material.

Mr. Lane asked what the objection is to using real brick and Mr. Bassett responded that the client likes the material and he himself likes it because of the difficulty getting a brick mason to do small bricking jobs such as this. He does not believe his client has a concern about the cost difference between real brick and the synthetic facsimile; it's just the brick mason issue.

Mr. Hertzler stated that the material needs to be authentic brick or a convincing fake. Mr. Klee agreed and added that if it were brick the request would sail through the approval process. Mr. Williams agreed that the design is no problem; it is the material that presents the concern. In response to Mr. Klee's question of what provision is in the ***Design Review Guidelines***, Mr. Quarles said the *Guidelines* only require that the material and design be compatible with the design of the building.

Mr. Hertzler moved that the sign be approved with the conditions that the base be brick and not simulated brick, the web information on the base be removed and that approval is granted from City Council to locate the sign on the City's right-of-way. Mr. Quarles seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 6-0.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:	Quarles, Williams, Lane, Hertzler, Klee, Edwards
Nay:	None
Absent:	Spence

### **CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

#### **ARB #06-019 Crockett/520 South England Street – Renovations and Addition to Single-Family Dwelling**

Michael Crockett, potential purchaser of the property, stated that he would like to know if the options he has presented to the Board are acceptable before he makes the purchase. He proposes:

- Raise roof – add full attic with addition on rear and detached garage in rear.
- Gambrel roof – with addition on rear and detached garage in rear.
- Gambrel roof with no extension and detached garage in rear.

Mr. Crockett noted that a lot of the work would be done over a period of time, such as the backyard brick walk. He added that he has three children, one of whom is a special needs child who will be with them all his life; they need two master bedrooms and the additional living space.

Chairman Williams offered the diversity and expertise of the Board, which includes engineers, architects and historians.

The Board's comments included:

- Gambrel roof is okay and could be supported. A Gambrel roof is more consistent with the neighborhood and surrounding area.
- Addition would be well under the maximum on the street.
- Expressed a concern with the difficulty in supporting two stories on the existing foundation.
- Prefer gambrel roof to two stories.
- Suggest applicant hire a architect to resolve the code issues for the walls and foundation.
- An addition on the rear such as a hyphen may be less costly than trying to retrofit the existing structure for a second story.
- Don't change front profile of house. Maybe steep enough grade to get living space out of the full basement in the rear.

At the applicant's request, the Board suggested several local architects. Mr. Crockett thanked the Board for their input.

**OTHER**

**Minutes for January 24, 2006**

The minutes for the January 24, 2006 meeting were approved as submitted.

**Design Review Guidelines**

The Board expressed serious concern if the Corridor Protection District is change to allow a CP-2 district for the area south of Route 199. A greater concern was expressed if this area is removed entirely from a Corridor Protection District. It was noted that the integrity of the *Guidelines* needs to be maintained and they should not be amended in response to a current situation.

**Yankee Candle Building**

Mr. Hertzler suggested that if the Yankee Candle building proposal had been seen in 3-D, it probably wouldn't have been approved with changes. He feels the building represents a failure of our system and wants to be sure it doesn't happen again. Mr. Hertzler said we need to require 3-D renderings of such proposals, like the Walgreen's proposal, which was an excellent example. Mrs. Murphy said she will pass this suggestion on to future applicants.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Donna Dee Scott  
Secretary